

STEVEN G. KALAR  
Federal Public Defender  
GALIA AMRAM (CABN 250551)  
Assistant Federal Public Defender  
450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36106  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Telephone: (415) 436-7700  
Facsimile: (415) 436-7706  
Galia\_Amram@fd.org  
Counsel for Defendant Jeffry HILL

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

JEFFRY HILL,

Defendant.

No. 16-CR-454 RS

**STIPULATION AND ~~[PROPOSED]~~  
ORDER TO CONTINUE STATUS  
CONFERENCE**

**I. STIPULATION**

The parties in this case agree and jointly request the Court to move the status conference scheduled in the above captioned case from December 13, 2016 to January 17, 2017 at 2:30 p.m. The reason for this request is that defense counsel requires additional time to review discovery, which to date includes over 17,000 pages of accounting records, over 10,000 pages of other paper discovery, and audio recordings and electronic device data.

The parties concur that granting the exclusion would allow the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation of counsel and continuity of counsel. *See* 18 U.S.C. §

3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). The parties also agree that the end of justice served by granting such an exclusion of time for the purposes of effective preparation of counsel outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A).

DATED: December 12, 2016                     /s/                      
BENJAMIN KINGSLEY  
Assistant United States Attorney


DATED: December 12, 2016                     /s/                      
GALIA AMRAM  
Attorney for Defendant Jeffry Hill

~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER

For the reasons stated above the Court hereby CONTINUES the status hearing in the aforementioned case from December 12, 2016 to January 17, 2017. The Court further finds that the exclusion from the time limits of this period applicable under 18 U.S.C. § 3161 is warranted and that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. Denying the requested exclusion of time would deprive the defendant effective preparation of counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 12/12/16

  
THE HONORABLE RICHARD SEEBORG  
United States District Judge